

with hearing loss and related disorders (e.g. vestibular/balance disorders).

The legislation would not expand or change the scope of practice for an audiologist, or alter the important relationship that exists between audiologists and Ear, Nose and Throat physicians. There would be no new benefits or services under this legislation. The bill I am introducing today, while technical in nature, would help establish uniform professional qualifications for audiologists, and a more reliable standard for the more than 28 million people with a hearing loss who may use audiological services.

EDUCATION FLEXIBILITY  
PARTNERSHIP ACT OF 1999

SPEECH OF

**HON. DAVID D. PHELPS**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 10, 1999*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 800) to provide for education flexibility partnerships:

Mr. PHELPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my strong support for H.R. 800, the Education Flexibility Partnership Act, of which I am proud to be a co-sponsor. I have made the improvement of our nation's public education system one of my top priorities as a legislator, and I believe that the Ed-Flex bill represents an important step towards the fulfillment of this goal. This legislation should not be viewed as a solution to the myriad problems which plague our schools, but I wholeheartedly support it and hope that the valuable debate it generates will catalyze our continued efforts on critical education issues.

H.R. 800 extends to all 50 states the opportunity to participate in the "Ed-Flex" program, currently in place as a demonstration program in 12 states. Under Ed-Flex, the Department of Education allows states to grant local school districts waivers to certain federal regulations if the state believes such a waiver would enhance local school reform efforts. I believe it is important for those of us in Washington to recognize that local officials, parents, teachers and students are often in a better position to creatively and effectively address the particular educational issues being faced in their communities. H.R. 800 will allow localities the flexibility to begin responding to the unique needs of their school systems, and I embrace any measure that will help our children obtain the top-quality education they need and deserve.

I must voice some concern that the accountability provisions of H.R. 800 are not as strong as they should be. I am, for example, disappointed that this body did not agree to the Miller-Kildee amendment, which would have required states to have in place a viable plan for assessing student achievement, as well as concrete goals for such achievement. In addition, it must be clearly understood that, although Ed-Flex can be an important component of our education reform efforts this session, many critical issues remain to be addressed, such as class size, school safety and student discipline.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting Ed-Flex today, not because

it solves all of our problems, but because it represents a substantive bipartisan effort to begin addressing the many difficulties which plague our local school systems. I am pleased that we are getting an early start in meeting our obligations to America's students, and I look forward to confronting these crucial education issues as the 106th Congress continues.

EDUCATION FLEXIBILITY  
PARTNERSHIP ACT OF 1999

SPEECH OF

**HON. JOSEPH CROWLEY**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 10, 1999*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 800) to provide for education flexibility partnerships:

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to state for the record my reasons for voting against H.R. 800 the Ed-Flex bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed to the idea of flexibility in education. I laud my colleagues for their desire to work on the education issues facing our country. Ed-Flex has the potential to be a workable program that provides states and local school districts with the flexibility to improve academic achievements and the quality of education for their students.

However, I believe that we need to protect those students who come from families in need. The intent of Congress, through Title I of the Elementary and Secondary School Act, was to target funds toward low-income students, in order to help them have a chance at success in life. I could not vote for Ed-Flex unless I was sure that students from low-income families are not going to lose their funds through waivers. This is why I supported the Scott-Payne amendment, which would have required that only schools in which at least 35% of the students come from low-income families may seek a waiver to use their Title I funds to operate a school-wide program. For my New York City District, this provision is especially important. We have many students coming from low-income families in the Bronx and Queens, and I cannot support a program that does not have provision to prohibit funds being taken away from those needy students.

I am also concerned about the timing of this legislation. In the coming year, we need to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. It does not make sense to me that we pass legislation to waive the requirements that we have not even written yet! The best solution would have been to consider Ed-Flex and ESEA together. Then, we could have worked to alleviate my concerns, and those of my colleagues, regarding the targeting of ESEA funds under the provisions of the Ed-Flex program.

Finally, I would like to express my dismay that the majority did not allow class-size reduction and school construction initiatives to be attached to H.R. 800. Public schools are working hard to raise academic standards and improve student achievement, but in many schools their efforts are hampered by overcrowded classes and inadequate and deteriorating facilities. Smaller class sizes improve student learning and are effective in improving

student achievement. But we cannot reduce class size without considering the condition and lack of space in school facilities. These issues go hand-in-hand. This is why I feel Ed-Flex should not have been considered now, but rather considered along with ESEA and school construction.

I strongly support bipartisan efforts to strengthen our school systems and help our students. I look forward to working with my colleagues on school construction legislation and on reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. It is with regret that I had to vote against the first education bill on the floor of the House in the 106th Congress and I thank you for allowing me the opportunity to outline my reasons for my opposition to H.R. 800.

HONORING REVEREND DR. H.M.  
CRENSHAW

**HON. MARCY KAPTUR**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 11, 1999*

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the work and achievements of a shepherd to our entire community, Reverend Dr. H.M. Crenshaw, a spiritual leader of enormous dimension. Reverend Crenshaw's 30 years of personal ministry to the Jerusalem Missionary Baptist Church congregation is to be recognized in a special celebration in Toledo, OH on March 13, 1999.

After his ordination as a minister in 1952, Reverend Crenshaw pastored in the First Baptist Church of Rossford, Ohio from 1953 until 1958. He then went on to First Baptist Church in Fostoria, OH, and during his decade-long tenure there he led the congregation in the building of a new church as well as the purchase of additional land. In December of 1968, Reverend Crenshaw was called to minister to the congregation of Jerusalem Missionary Baptist Church, where he remains today.

A true community leader, Reverend Crenshaw has guided his congregation through growth, property acquisition, and building expansion and enhancement. Through it all, he has been a revitalizing force both in the community and the church. Recognizing the deeper needs of the youth in the church's neighborhood, Reverend Crenshaw founded the Jerusalem Outreach Center in 1982. With a goal to motivate and direct young people not targeted by other programs to fully realize their greatest potential, Reverend Crenshaw and the Jerusalem Outreach Center staff have helped over 1,675 at-risk youth and their families. Working through referrals from the juvenile court and juvenile justice systems, the local school system and an area mentoring program, the Jerusalem Outreach Center has redirected the path for these young people and their families. Further, the center serves as a beacon in the neighborhood: a welcoming place for the youth.

Ever mindful of the need to provide stewardship to promising young people, Reverend and Mrs. Crenshaw established the Crenshaw Scholarship Fund in memory of their deceased daughter Marilyn. This fund has contributed over \$12,500.00 toward the college education of students in the church.

The holder of a Bachelor of Theology from the International Bible Institute and Seminary,

a Master of Arts in Psychology and Counseling from Ashland Theological Seminary, a Doctorate of Divinity from Calvary Bible College, and an Honorary Doctorate from Selma University, Reverend Crenshaw is the author of a book, "A Reality Roadmap for Delinquent Youth" and a teaching video, "The Reality of Therapeutic Techniques in Working with Delinquent Youth."

In addition to pastoring to his congregation, engaging in outreach to troubled youth, and raising a family, Reverend Crenshaw has also found time to serve on several key area boards including the Lucas County Criminal Justice Coordinating Council, Lucas County Mental Health Advisory Council, Baptist Pastors' Conference, Interdenominational Ministerial Alliance, Interracial Religious Coalition, Board of Community Relations, the Board of Education's Alternative School Programming Committee, Baptist Ministers Conference, and Chairman of the Advisory Board of the American Baptist Theological Seminary Extension of Toledo.

His unwavering commitment to the causes of social justice, his dedication to God and living His Word, and his deep involvement in the fabric of our community have earned Reverend Crenshaw the admiration of many in our area who hold him in high esteem. He has been showered with honors too numerous to mention, has received commendations from federal, state, and city officials, and has received accolades from his peers in the psychology, counseling, and ministerial fields.

Reverend Crenshaw is married to Frances, and together they have raised five children: Marvin, Shirley, the late Marilyn, Vanessa and Kay. They are also proud and loving grandparents to O'Shai and O'Lajidai, and great grandson O'Mauryai.

The constant thread through Reverend Crenshaw's life of service is his devotion to "his ministry in saving souls." I am greatly honored and deeply humbled to join his congregation and community in offering thanks for his 30 years as pastor of Jerusalem Missionary Baptist Church. May God continue to bless him, his wife, their family and the Jerusalem Missionary Baptist Church congregation.

#### INTRODUCTION OF HATE CRIMES PREVENTION ACT OF 1999

**HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 11, 1999*

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be introducing the Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 1999, along with Representatives MORELLA, BALDWIN and FORBES. As of today there are 118 original cosponsors. This legislation will amend Federal law to enhance the ability of Federal prosecutors to combat racial and religious savagery, and will permit Federal prosecution of violence motivated by prejudice against the victim's sexual orientation, gender or disability.

In 1963, the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church in Birmingham, was dynamited by the Ku Klux Klan. The killing of four African-American girls preparing for a religious ceremony shocked the Nation and acted as a catalyst for the civil rights movement. Last month, 36 years after the brutal bombing in Birmingham, Alabama

was witness to another heinous act of violence motivated by base bigotry. The beating and burning of Billy Jack Gaither is testament to the reality that a guarantee of civil rights is not enough if violence motivated by hatred and prejudice continues. The atrocity, coming on the heels of last year's torture and murder of James Byrd in Jasper, TX and Matthew Shepard in Laramie, WY illustrates the need for the passage of the Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 1999.

Current Federal hate crimes law only covers crimes motivated by racial, religious or ethnic prejudice. Our bill adds violence motivated by prejudice against the victim's sexual orientation, gender or disability. This legislation also makes it easier for Federal authorities to prosecute racial, religious and ethnic violence, in the same way that the Church Arson Prevention Act of 1996 helped Federal prosecutors combat church arson by loosening the unduly rigid jurisdictional requirements under Federal law for prosecuting church arson.

Under my legislation, States will continue to take the lead in the persecution of hate crimes. In the years 1991 through 1997 there were more than 50,000 hate crimes reported. From 1990 through 1998, there were 42 Federal hate crimes prosecutions nationwide under the original hate crimes statute. Our bill will result only in a modest increase in the number of Federal prosecutions of hate crimes. The Attorney General or other high ranking Justice Department officials must approve all prosecution under this law. This requirement ensures Federal restraint, and ensures that States will continue to take the lead.

At one time lynchings were commonplace in our Nation. Nearly 4,000 African Americans were tortured and killed between 1880 and 1930. Today, Americans are being tortured and killed not only because of their race, but also because of their religion, their disability, their sex, and their sexual orientation. It is long past time that Congress passed a comprehensive law banning such contemptible acts. It is a Federal crime to hijack an automobile or to possess cocaine and it ought to be a Federal crime to drag a man to death because of his race or to hang a man because of his sexual orientation. These are crimes that shock and shame our national conscience and they should be subject to Federal law enforcement assistance and prosecution. There certainly is a role for the States, but far too many States have no hate crimes laws and many existing laws do not specify sexual orientation as a category for protection.

This problem cuts across party lines, and I am glad to be joined by so many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in proposing this legislation today. This is a battle we cannot afford to lose—we owe it to the thousands of African Americans who have been lynched, and we owe it to the families of James Byrd, Matthew Shepard and Billy Jack Gaither.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY

**HON. BERNARD SANDERS**

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 11, 1999*

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to an article printed in the

March edition of the Labor Party Press, and submit the article to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for my colleagues' benefit:

[Labor Party Press, Volume 4, Number 2,  
March 1999]

"DON'T BLOW AWAY SOCIAL SECURITY" (PART  
2 OF 3)

WHAT'S WRONG WITH PRIVATIZING SOCIAL  
SECURITY?

#### 1. The stock market is volatile.

The stock market goes up and up. And sometimes it goes down and down. Even without an economic catastrophe, the stock market's volatility would make our retirement income entirely unpredictable. Dean Baker has noted that if the economy grows as slowly as the Social Security trustees are predicting, then the prognosis for the stock market isn't too rosy either. Social Security barely covers seniors' expenses as it is now.

Former Congressional Budget Office director Robert Reischauer has pointed out that if we had private Social Security accounts back in 1969, a person retiring in that year would have had a 60 percent larger payout upon retirement than someone retiring seven years later, after the market dipped. John Mueller, a former economic advisor to the House Republicans, makes a similar observation. Since 1900, he notes, there have been three 20-year periods in which returns on the stock market fell to about zero. In between were periods of positive returns. "This meant that some people earned a negative real return from investing in the stock market, while others received a real pretax return as high as 10 percent." For retirees, it would be the luck of the draw.

Under our current system, the government bears the risk of economic downturn, and we're all promised a constant monthly amount of retirement income. Under a privatized system, we each individually bear the risk. Even the cleverest investor will likely lose money in a major financial downturn. And not all of us are so clever—or can afford to spend our time playing amateur Wall Street trader.

#### 2. Shifting to a privatized system would require a hugely expensive period of transition.

Say we begin establishing private Social Security accounts for all of us Americans who are currently working and under 65. Who will generate funds to cover the current retirees? You and me. Essentially, the next several generations of Americans would have to pay twice—once into our own fund, and again to sustain current retirees. According to one estimate, full-scale privatization of Social Security would require about \$6.5 trillion in additional taxes over the next seventy-two years. The Employee Benefits Research Institute estimates that transition costs could amount to something like 5 percent of the nation's Gross Domestic Product for the next 40 years. By instituting privatization, we'd be starting a Social Security crisis, not ending one.

#### 3. Maintaining private accounts will be costly.

Many of us tend to think that any federal program must be incredibly inefficient and bureaucratic. A Roper poll asked Americans to estimate the administrative costs of Social Security as a percentage of benefits. They guessed, on average, 50 percent. The real answer is one percent. Only one percent of the money that goes into Social Security is spent on administration. By comparison, the administrative costs for private insurance are about 13 percent of annual benefit amounts.

The main reason Social Security administration is so cheap is that the whole fund is invested in one place, the U.S. Treasury. Imagine the administrative cost of managing